

Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 1-8


Applicants provisionally traverse the rejection and will deal with the issue at the time of allowance of the pending claims.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-8

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Gassenmeier *et al.* (U. S. Pat. Appl. No. 2001/0031714 A1). Applicants traverse the rejection and have amended claims 1, 2 and 4-8 and have cancelled claim 3. All amendments are supported explicitly from the specification. Gassenmeier *et al.* does not teach Applicants invention with regard to the ionic strength element and alkali soluble polymers claimed by Applicants. Gassenmeier teaches acid soluble polymers such as poly amines [0024 and 0137 to 0155]. Gassenmeier *et al.* equate ionic strength as equal to electrolyte concentration, which is not a conventionally accepted definition of ionic strength. Moreover, it is an incorrect definition concerning cations and anions having charges greater than unity. Applicants submits the invention as presented in amended claims, is patentable over Gassenmeier *et al.* of record.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues related to this application by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Stephen E. Johnson
Attorney/Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,916
Telephone: (215) 619-5478
Facsimile: (215) 619-1654

Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399
December 14, 2005